

---

# 6

## Action Item

### *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 2002, Meeting

---



---

---

# MINUTES

## *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Meeting of June 4, 2002

---

**Committee members present** Evonne Seron Schulze, *Chair*  
Odessa P. Johnson, *Vice Chair*  
Howard Welinsky  
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*  
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

**Other Commissioners present**  
Lance Izumi  
Robert L. Moore  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.  
Olivia K. Singh

**Committee members absent** Irwin S. Field  
Susan Hammer  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Rachel E. Shetka  
Melinda G. Wilson

---

**Call to order** Committee Chair Schulze called the Executive Committee to order at 9:56 a.m.

---

**Roll call** Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll and the following committee members were not present: Field, Hammer, Jhin, Shetka, and Wilson.

---

**Needs analysis review for the off-campus center at Otay Mesa proposed by the Southwestern Community College District**

Chair Schulze welcomed several guests from San Diego who were in attendance for consideration of the *Needs Analysis Review for the Off-Campus Center at Otay Mesa Proposed by the Southwestern Community College District*.

Because staff member Gil Velazquez sustained injuries in a very serious car accident and had not yet returned to work, Deputy Director Leveille made the presentation of this item. He stated that Mr. Velazquez had expressed his appreciation to Commission members and staff for their expressions of concern.

Deputy Director Leveille said the item was reviewed as an information item at the last Commission meeting. Since then, three areas of concern have been resolved: (1) there has been progress with the relationship with CETIS; (2) the academic program activity and relationships with external stakeholders has been clarified; and (3) a letter of support has been provided by the San Diego Community College District.

The President of the Southwestern Community College District, Dr. Serafin Zasqueta, was invited to address the Committee. He thanked Chair Schulze and informed the Committee that local high schools were also involved as partners in early readiness

programs and that he brought a copy of a Memorandum of Understanding to be included in the proposal. Dr. Zasqueta thanked the Committee and the Commission for supporting the proposal.

Dr. Ethan Singer of San Diego State University was introduced and said that he had been working with colleges to solve access problems in the southern part of the city and county and that different solutions were being tried. He said this proposal is a unique opportunity to help this under-served area and has unique programs to interest students and teachers.

Deputy Director Leveille introduced several other guests from the San Diego area that were in the audience in support of the proposal. Director Fox congratulated Drs. Zasqueta and Singer and their colleagues on their persistence and hard work involving this project.

Commissioner Pesqueira commented that this new off-campus center represents a way to serve certain areas without building a new campus. He added that San Diego State University is unable to enroll all eligible students in that area. The Otay Mesa center is the answer for many in south San Diego County, the overall cost to attend college will be less, and will give hope to marginal high school students. He also congratulated Dr. Zasqueta for his tenacity in “bull-dogging” this project. Commissioner Pesqueira commented that a San Diego State University off-campus center in the Imperial Valley should be expanded.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked Drs. Zasqueta and Singer to extend the Commission’s best wishes to President Webber of San Diego State University. He asked about the anticipated grand opening timeline and about the status of the cross-border relationship with CETIS.

Dr. Zasqueta said that groundbreaking for the new center would be in about a year, with the campus opening another year thereafter. He stated that they were in the process of identifying specific relationships and formalizing those with CETIS. He added that CETIS would like to have a campus presence at Otay Mesa, but has limited resources. Dr. Zasqueta affirmed that they were continuing to work with CETIS and that enhancing the learning experience was the common goal.

Chair Arkatov suggested that a letter from the Commission to CETIS to encourage their collaboration might be helpful. Dr. Zasqueta agreed that it would.

Commissioner Johnson asked about the high school planned for the Otay Mesa campus. Dr. Zasqueta informed the Committee that the high school would open in August but, because of increased land costs and location acquisition problems, it had to be moved to a site 1.5 miles from the high school. Dr. Singer clarified that the high school will offer some programs on their campus to start. Commissioner Johnson concluded by saying that this program should be commended.

Commissioner Pesqueira asked about the relationship with Mexico. Dr. Singer stated that out-of-country study is one of the program requirements and that student exchange programs were in place including fee waivers for non-resident/exchange students.

Commissioner Pesqueira asked if there is space available at the site for student housing and suggested the possible utilization of vacant commercial space for classrooms during the construction phase. Dr. Zasueta stated that they were working on the availability of housing surrounding the site, and that they could explore Commissioner Pesqueira's suggestion regarding the commercial space.

Committee Chair Schulze stated that the Commission viewed the proposal favorably and thanked the presenters for their vision and tenacity, adding that they should be commended for their work.

A motion to send a letter of approval of the Otay Mesa Off-Campus Center was approved unanimously by the three Committee members present. Commission Chair Arkatov and Vice Chair Chandler, voting ex officio, did so in favor of the motion.

---

**Educational  
technology report:  
The AB 1123  
task force**

Deputy Director Leveille presented the Educational Technology Report of the AB 1123 Task Force. He said the item was provided for information and that it would return for action by the Committee and Commission at the July meeting in order to meet the August 1 legislative deadline to forward the report to the governor and the Legislature. He provided a PowerPoint slide presentation on detailed aspects of the activity and of the report.

Deputy Director Leveille reported that AB 1123, the legislative bill prompting this report, was authored by Assembly member Dennis Cardoza and directed the Commission to take the lead in convening an advisory committee to facilitate the development of statewide funding priorities for educational technology in higher education. He emphasized that every issue considered by the Task Force reflected the importance of educational technology in the higher education enterprise. The report draws attention to guiding principles for budgeting priorities in this arena, that education technology should not be treated as "bolt-on" or "add-on" items, but that budget decisions be based on the principle that educational technology is infused in all activities in higher education. He pointed out the earlier presentation to the Commission regarding the Digital California Project, as a public and private collaboration, as one such example.

Commissioner Arkatov thanked Deputy Director Leveille for stepping in to complete the report in the absence of the original staff assigned to this project that have since left the Commission. Commissioner Arkatov then asked if the Commission should seek a set-aside for e-learning in bond measures on behalf of under-served students. Deputy Director Leveille replied that the Commission has always supported joint use of facilities, including e-learning facilities, and that the report responds to the legislation with recommendations for budgeting priorities.

Commissioner Arkatov asked whether the Commission should take the recommendations to add to bond facilities development for the next round of bond proposals, noting that it is too late for the November ballot. Deputy Director Leveille replied that an Executive Summary for the report is still to be developed and that it would include that suggestion.

Chair Schulze commented that the committee's deliberations should focus on suggesting ways to the forward the report goals and recommendations.

Alternate Commissioner Pesqueira asked if the recommendations were proscriptive. Deputy Director Leveille responded that the Commission could suggest what it believed to be the State's highest need and that the report's recommendations could be used to hold the segments accountable. Commissioner Pesqueira suggested that the Commission could work on reducing tensions rather than just holding people accountable.

Commissioner Johnson stated that she would like to see more emphasis on the digital divide. Commissioner Singh added the perspective that readiness for the new technologies must be assured rather than viewing things in an outmoded way.

Commissioner Moore stated that the area this report addresses is critical. The Commission needs to comment on how the higher education system is doing and that the Commission add value to the segments' efforts to upgrade educational programs. The report can focus on the broader implications, not as dictates but as "add-to" items. Also, the Commission, through this report, can suggest how the segmental efforts can be evaluated.

Chair Schulze stated that the Commission has a chance, in this report, to really make a difference.

Commissioner Pesqueira stated his agreement with Commissioner Singh's comments, noting that, five years ago, the California State University facilities director started to plan for educational technology, including wired floors and other things to upgrade the State University facilities.

Commission Chair Arkatov stated that the educational technology arena is where education is going in the future -- from supply (teachers) to demand (students). He said the Commission is key and needs to have the flexibility to respond.

---

**The California  
Postsecondary  
Education  
Commission's role  
in academic  
program planning,  
approval, and  
review**

Commission member Joan Sallee reported on the *Commission's Role in Academic Program Planning, Approval, and Review*, stating that academic program review, while not always very visible, adds significant value to the higher education enterprise and was one of the areas suggested to be retained in the Commission's plan of work by the Legislative Analyst's Office.

She added that staff efforts were divided among reviews for the community colleges, University of California and State University programs. Based on long-established guidelines, the Commission may review, concur, not concur and sometimes approve new academic degree programs. The cyclical reviews of multi-year academic program plans are also included in the review process.

On a technical note, Ms. Sallee apologized for a few typographical and formatting errors (specifically a citation on page 13 and in the Conclusion section on page 15) in the draft report and assured the Committee that they would be corrected in the final draft.

Chair Schulze asked how often do the systems comport to Commission recommendations. Ms. Sallee responded that most often this is the case, adding that the segments

usually abide by Commission staff evaluations, especially those directly related to the Commission's guidelines.

Director Fox commented that this area of staff effort, and the time taken to review these proposals, is difficult to quantify. Ms. Sallee added that the process was often one of give-and-take, but that the Commission's guidelines withstand the disagreements.

Commissioner Arkatov commented that it is hard for the average legislator to get a handle on this function and asked how we can clarify and highlight the Commission's role for that audience.

Commissioner Pesqueira commented that he had not given much thought to this function except at the system level, but the Commission's guidelines provided clarity and perspective of the societal needs and considerations in this area.

Commissioner Moore agreed that academic program review is "a tough sell" and asked what specific examples could the Commission provide where it has made a difference, suggesting a need for more justification for the decisions made regarding the reviews outlined in the report. Chair Schulze agreed, also noting a need for more information on what influences Commission decisions in these instances.

---

**Recess**    The Committee recessed briefly at 11:30 a.m. in order to convene the full Commission.

---

**Reconvene**    The Educational Policy and Programs Committee was reconvened at 11:36 a.m. and Ms. Sallee continued with her report. She responded the Commissioners earlier comments by clarifying that the Commission brings an over-arching perspective of State needs and societal concerns to the consideration of new degree programs, noting that the segments are understandably parochial in their focus but the Commission is not. She assured the Committee that the next iteration of the report would provide evidence of the tangible differences in the Commission's analysis of the individual programs, including cost savings, at the next Commission meeting.

Commissioner Moore thanked Ms. Sallee for her elegant response to the Commissioners' concerns.

Commissioner Arkatov asked how or whether staff considers private postsecondary influences, noting that Harvard professors are teaching at Kaplan colleges and the University of Phoenix is utilizing University of California and California State University professors.

In response to an earlier expressed Committee concern, Commission staff member Murray Haberman clarified to the Committee that it is exceedingly rare that the segments have gone against the Commission's recommendations, including 150 reviews in the 18 months.

Also in response to an earlier Committee concern regarding the perceived lack of importance or visibility of this Commission function, staff member Karl Engelbach informed the Committee that academic program review was one of the three areas sug-

gested for retention in the Assembly version of the budget language that is currently being considered by the Budget Conference Committee.

Commissioner Moore acknowledged that, but stated that the language is troubling and not acceptable to him.

---

**Adjournment** Chair Schulze adjourned the Committee meeting at 11:45 a.m.

---